IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE: Chapter 11

W.R. GRACE & CO., Case No. 01-01139(JKF) Jointly Administered et al.,

Debtors. Dec. 19, 2011 (9:05 a.m.)

(Wilmington)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDITH K. FITZGERALD UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

Appearances:

For the Debtors: Janet S. Baer, Esq.

Roger Higgins, Esq.

Baer Higgins Fruchtman LLC Kathleen P. Makowski, Esq.

Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl & Jones

Adam Paul, Esq. Kirkland & Ellis Richard Finke, Esq. W.R. Grace & Co.

Gabriella Cellarosi, Esq. For Maryland Casualty:

Edward Longosz, Esq.

Eckert, Seamans, Cherin & Mellott

Jeffrey C. Wisler, Esq.

Connolly, Bove, Lodge & Hutz LLP

For Property Damage Alan B. Rich, Esq.

FCR: Law Office of Alan B. Rich

For Everest Reinsurance: Leslie A. Davis, Esq.

Mark Plevin, Esq. Crowell & Moring LLP Brian L. Kasprzak, Esq.

Marks, O'Neill, O'Brien & Courtney

For the Asbestos

Robert M. Horkovich, Esq. Anderson, Kill & Olick Committee:

> Mark Hurford, Esq. Campbell & Levine Peter Lockwood, Esq. Caplin & Drysdale

Jay Sakalo, Esq.

Bilzin, Sumberg, Baena, Price

For the Committee of Arlene G. Krieger, Esq,

Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP Michael R. Lastowski, Esq. Unsecured Creditors:

2

Duane Morris LLP

Alexander Sanders, Jr., Esq. For Alexander Sanders:

Alexander Sanders, Jr.

Audio Operator: Dana Moore

Transcriber: Elaine M. Ryan

(302) 683-0221

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

- 1 THE CLERK: All rise.
- THE COURT: Good morning, please be seated.
- 3 ALL: Good morning, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: The first matter is W.R. Grace,
- 5 Bankruptcy No. 01-1139. Participating by phone: Janet Baer,
- 6 Gabriella Cellarosi, Leslie Davis, Richard Finke, Roger
- 7 Higgins, Robert Horkovich, Mark Hurford, Brian Kasprzak,
- 8 Arlene Krieger, Michael Lastowski, Peter Lockwood, Edward
- 9 Longosz, Kathleen Makowski, Adam Paul, Mark Plevin, Alan
- 10 Rich, Jay Sakalo, Alexander Sanders, Jeffrey Wisler that's
- 11 all.
- MS. BAER (TELEPHONIC): Good morning, Your Honor.
- 13 Janet Baer on behalf of the debtors.
- 14 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Baer.
- 15 MS. BAER (TELEPHONIC): Your Honor, this should be a
- 16 very quick hearing. We only have one matter left on the
- 17 agenda. Matters 1 through 3 were continued. Matter 4 was
- 18 the fee matter where the order was entered. Matter 5 was
- 19 withdrawn and that takes us to matter 6 which is the debtors'
- 20 application to amend the employment order related to PWC.
- 21 Your Honor, a certificate of no objection was filed, but we
- 22 understand that the Court has some questions about this and
- 23 Adam Paul on behalf of the debtors is on to respond to any
- 24 questions the Court may have.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. My concern simply is that

- 1 it's asking the PWC not be responsible for keeping time
- 2 records in accord with the case management order, and my
- 3 concern is that this case is still on Well, it's before the
- 4 District Court and whatever the status is for confirmation,
- 5 and to the extent that it comes back and I have to rule on
- 6 fees, I need the time records. I don't know how I'm going to
- 7 be able to make the rulings without the time records. So,
- 8 that's my issue. Mr. Paul?
- 9 MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): Yes. Good morning, Your
- 10 Honor. Thanks for scheduling this short hearing so we can
- 11 address any concerns that you have. Essentially the genesis
- of this application to amend came to the client because the
- 13 client has been renegotiating the fee structure with PWC. I
- 14 approached the U.S. Trustee and the Fee Examiner with the
- 15 suggestion that PWC be allowed to dispense, as you point out,
- 16 with keeping their detailed monthly time records but instead
- 17 provide a summary, a more detailed summary in the fee
- 18 application itself along with a spreadsheet that shows the
- 19 hours by individual and the total amount of hours worked on
- 20 the Grace matter by each PWC individual with the
- 21 understanding that to the extent that the U.S. Trustee or the
- 22 Fee Examiner needed further information with respect to what
- 23 PWC is doing, they could always do so, and then also with the
- 24 understanding that what PWC is doing at this point is not
- 25 restructuring related, it's only focused on auditing work or

- 1 compliance with Sarbanes-Oxley, and so given the fact that
- 2 we're not dealing with any restructuring work, given the fact
- 3 that we've got a history here of, I believe it's 108 monthly
- 4 fee applications, which doesn't sound good when you say it,
- 5 108 monthly fee applications, that all of them have been
- 6 granted following the filing of a CNO, and so, given the
- 7 history here you deal to determine "you" meaning either the
- 8 Court, the U.S. Trustee, the Fee Examiner, whether or not
- 9 there's a material difference even setting aside the fact
- 10 that of course my client's going to be able to tell whether
- or not there's a material difference in PWC's fees. So,
- 12 given all of that, we thought that it would be best to
- 13 dispense with PWC having to keep those detailed time records
- 14 which would also save the estate a significant amount of
- 15 money going forward if this case continues on to the Third
- 16 Circuit and, you know, who knows how long that might take.
- 17 So that's the thought process behind it, Your Honor.
- 18 THE COURT: Well, I appreciate the thought process.
- 19 I was pretty sure that's what the thought process was, but I
- 20 still don't know how I'm going to make the comparisons that I
- 21 need to make without the detail if that's something that I'm
- 22 going to have to continue to do, and based on the fact that
- 23 the total fees in this case, according to the last
- 24 spreadsheet, has exceeded \$147 million it seems to me that
- 25 the additional amounts that would be required for PWC to keep

- 1 those records are probably not material. So, what is the
- 2 difference in keeping the time records versus doing what
- 3 you're suggesting?
- 4 MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): From what I understand from
- 5 PWC over a 12-month period it could allow for a savings to
- 6 the estate of approximately \$100,000. So, from our
- 7 perspective and given this is only with respect to PWC who's
- 8 only focused on auditing work that was material to Grace
- 9 especially in the context of renegotiating the fee structure
- 10 for PWC going forward which, again, not only do we hope that
- 11 the Court would grant this application which would allow for
- 12 savings, but we're also negotiating, hopefully, a lower fee
- 13 structure so the fees monthly by PWC wouldn't even exceed the
- 14 previous 108 monthly fee applications that they filed.
- 15 THE COURT: Well, I've explained my concern, Mr.
- 16 Paul. I don't think I'm going to grant the order as it's
- 17 currently crafted, so, you either need to go back and
- 18 renegotiate or you need to get PWC within some form of, you
- 19 know, the typical monthly retainers that don't come before
- 20 the Court because they're within the fee cap that the Court's
- 21 previously authorized or something. I just don't know how
- 22 I'm going to be able to make that assessment without the
- 23 detailed records, and -
- MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): Would Pardon me, Your
- 25 Honor. Would the Court be amenable to allowing PWC to keep -

- 1 rather than keep it in tenths of an hour increments, there is
- 2 precedent for allowing PWC specifically or other auditors to
- 3 keep time records in either half hour or hour increments and
- 4 that way you can determine the amount of time spent by a PWC
- 5 auditor on a particular matter, however, it's not going to be
- 6 as taxing, no pun intended, for the PWC auditor to keep those
- 7 time records?
- 8 THE COURT: I don't have a problem with half hour or
- 9 hour time increments except for the fact that occasionally
- 10 there are things like telephone calls that are two minutes.
- 11 So, how do I make those assessments? That's the problem. My
- 12 responsibility in looking at these things is to essentially
- 13 true-up what's happening within the case, and the Fee
- 14 Auditor, frankly, has been doing a fabulous job, but the Fee
- 15 Auditor too has had the opportunity to compare one
- 16 professional with another, and I understand that when you're
- 17 doing audit work you can be working for a very long time on a
- 18 specific project and if that's the case you work 8 hours a
- 19 day, for example on one project, that's pretty easy just to
- 20 say you've worked 8 hours a day on one project, you don't
- 21 have to worry about tenth of an hour increments. So, I'm
- 22 still at a loss as to where there is going to be a material
- 23 time savings and where the detail is somehow or other going
- 24 to be different that the ten-minute intervals. I'm not
- 25 trying to be difficult, Mr. Paul. It's just that, you know,

- 1 I have an obligation too. One thing that the <u>Busy Beaver</u>
- 2 decision was quite clear about is this Court has to do an
- 3 independent examination of the fees, and so I think I need it
- 4 in the fashion that helps me. It's not just the U.S. Trustee
- 5 and the debtor, it's the Court too. So, I'm not going to
- 6 grant this the way it is. If you can put it into some other
- 7 fashion that satisfies the issues, fine, but not that
- 8 \$100,000 isn't a lot of money, it's about my full salary, so
- 9 I appreciate the fact that it's a lot of money in the
- 10 abstract, but compared to what's happened with respect to the
- 11 fees overall, it's a pittance. So, I just don't see at this
- 12 time that the problem that this Court may face if it has to
- 13 go back and have the records redone when the information may
- 14 not be available warrants that type of change at this time in
- 15 this case. So -
- MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): I appreciate that, Your
- 17 Honor.
- 18 THE COURT: All right, so, you know, I think you
- 19 need to readjust. I'm willing to take If a particular
- 20 timekeeper has done nothing but work on the audit of one of
- 21 the enterprises, and that's what the record says, you know, 8
- 22 hours, 10 hours, however much it is on that audit work, I
- 23 will accept that, but to the extent that there is something
- 24 that's been done in smaller increments, I think it has to be
- 25 carried out that way at least until the District Court

- 1 determines that the case actually is or isn't confirmed. If
- 2 it's confirmed, you won't get so much of a problem with me
- 3 even if it goes to the Third Circuit, but at this point, I
- 4 don't know what the District Court's going to do and I don't
- 5 know if it's coming back here.
- 6 MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): I appreciate that, Your
- 7 Honor. To the extent that the District Court rules in favor
- 8 of the debtor, then we would I would assume, the Court
- 9 wouldn't have an objection to us renewing the motion at that
- 10 point during the pendency of an appeal to the Third Circuit,
- 11 if there is one.
- 12 THE COURT: I have no problem with your renewing
- 13 this motion at any point in time but specifically then.
- 14 MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): Okay, very well, Your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: All right, so, do you want to go back
- 16 and Do you want me to put this on next month's agenda to
- 17 see if you can get this worked out on a certification of
- 18 counsel?
- MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): Yeah, that would work, or,
- 20 you know, hopefully the District Court may enter an order in
- 21 the intervening period.
- THE COURT: I hope so, but just in case not, then
- 23 it's continued to the January omnibus and if you file a new
- 24 order on a COC I'll certainly take a look at it. I have no
- 25 problem with anything else in the request other than this

```
1
     timekeeping issue.
 2
               MR. PAUL (TELEPHONIC): Okay, Your Honor, thank you.
               THE COURT: Ms. Baer?
 3
 4
               MS. BAER (TELEPHONIC): Your Honor, I think that
     concludes the agenda from the debtors' perspective.
               THE COURT: Okay, thank you all. Happy Holidays.
 6
 7
               All: Thank you, Your Honor, same to you.
 8
               (Whereupon at 9:16 a.m., the hearing in this matter
 9
     was concluded for this date.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
                    I, Elaine M. Ryan, approved transcriber for
     the United States Courts, certify that the foregoing is a
19
20
     correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the
21
     proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
22
     <u>/s/ Elaine M. Ryan</u>
                                              February 10, 2012
     Elaine M. Ryan
     2801 Faulkland Rd.
     Wilmington, DE 19808
     (302) 683-0221
```